

REMARKS

Entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested, in response to the Quayle action of April 16, 2008.

In order to clarify claim 9, amendments have been made to the claim to better describe the control function limitation which was the subject of the Examiner's objection. It is considered that the level of detail now recited for the control of the cells of the second row is commensurate with that of the control of the first-row cells, so that the claim is not longer potentially ambiguous in this regard. Applicants also point out that, although the language of this limitation may at first appearance seem a bit awkward, the entire limitation is an object clause modifying the subject: "wherein the control unit...is capable of controlling" of lines 8-9 of the claim. Read in this manner, the language flows naturally, and it is clear that the second row cells are controlled in the same way as the first-row cells, which should not be at all ambiguous.

Prompt and favorable further action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

/Richard Turner/
Richard C. Turner
Registration No. 29,710

Date: July 15, 2008